

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-5 are in the case and presented for consideration.

Claim 2, which was objected to for referring to a "portable phone", has been amended to properly depend from claim 1. Claim 1 has also been amended to better define the invention and distinguish it over the prior art. Claims 6-9 have been cancelled.

U.S. Patent 5,657,370 to Tsugane et al., indeed describes "the 1st housing ..' and the 2nd housing ...formed separately from each other to be slidable in one direction to form a closed state in which the said 1st housing and 2nd housing overlap one another, and to form an opened state in which the top face of either member is exposed", however, it does not describe any concrete structure which is formed as in the present invention.

Tsugane et al. neither description nor suggestions guide groove provided on both sides of other member of said first member and said second member, guide said guide member of the hinge device in an engaged state and a recessed portion provided on each guide groove to receive and lock the guide member of the hinge device at a predetermined slide position.

A slider 8 of Tsugane et al., as shown in Fig. 5, is merely a fixed member and not resiliently biased so as to be movable in one direction. Further a guide groove of

Tsugane et al. does not have a recessed portion to lock the slider 8 at a predetermined slide position, as stated in the claim 1 of the present invention.

Therefore the two inventions are different from each other in structure, and in operations and effects. Further Tsugane et al. does not have a hinge device of a structure in such details as closed in the claim 2 of the present application.

The above is true for U.S. Patent 6,370,362 to Hansen et al. as well, which neither sets forth nor suggests pair by pair of hinge devices each provided with guide members attached to both side of one member of either the first member or the second member leaving a space, allowing the guide members to expose to be movable forward and backward by being biased slidably in one direction, and a recessed portion provided on the each guide groove to receive and lock the guide member of the hinge device at a predetermined slide position.

Furthermore, Hansen neither discloses nor suggests a hinge device formed as in the claim 2 of the present invention.

Accordingly, the invention of claims 1 and 2, as amended, does not have the structure Tsugane et al., and thus is novel over this reference. The claimed invention is also not easily created in view of Hansen et al. either.

Of the other claims, claim 3 is dependent on claim 1 which is believed to be

patentable, and claims 4 and 5 relate to portable phones having the main features of claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, it is believed that all the claims should be allowed.

To help clarify, the present invention will now be discussed further.

The Examiner, seems to considers a "guide member" of the present invention and a "guide groove" of Tsugane et al. to be the same structure; however, both are not the same: "guide member" of the present invention is a member, slidably biased in one direction, e.g. a ball bearing, and not merely a "guide groove". The present invention describes with the term "guide groove" another structure, which are called "guide grooves 4b and 4b" to be slidably engaged with the above "guide member".

Further, although the Examiner holds that "slider 8" is equivalent to "hinge device" of the present invention, is set out in col. 4, lines 18 to 37 of the reference, the "hinge device" of the present invention is clearly differe from the "slider 8" in structure.

Moreover, "recessed portions (4d) according to the claim 1 of the present in ention are clearly different in structure and function from "front surface recessed portion 9", which is set forth in col. 4, lines 38 to 47 of Tsugane et al.; "recessed portions 4d" of the present invention are formed on a pair of guide grooves for locking guide members thereto.

In addition, an "engagement means" according to the I claim 1 of the present invention is different from a "wiring 11" of Tsugane et al., and not identical to it.

By this amendment, thus, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter C. Michalos  
Reg. No. 28,643  
Attorney for Applicants  
(845) 359-7700

Dated: January 3, 2006

**NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.**  
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110  
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100  
**Customer No. 21706**

M:\PAT-AMD\G121-082US.amendment.wpd